



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/043,212

01/14/2002

Akemi Tsuyuki

020033

6185

38834

7590

11/02/2006

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP  
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW  
SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/043,212

**Applicant(s)**

TSUYUKI, AKEMI

**Examiner**

Susan Y. Chen

**Art Unit**

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 20-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 20-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Response to Amendment***

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/20/2006 has been entered.

Claims 1-7 and 20-27, are pending for examination, claims 1 and 20 have been amended.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1 and 20, are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claims 1 and 20, the meaning of the acronym "CIF" should be clearly cited at least at the first time it is appeared in the claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 and 20-27, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claims 1 and 20, the claimed subject matter "the information and the scope as designated" lacks of antecedent basis.

As to claims 2-7 and 21-27, these claims have the same defects as their base claims 1 and 20 respectively, hence are rejected for the same reason.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 20-27, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eaton (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,567) in view of Tarlton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,330).

As to claim 1, Eaton discloses an associating information management system for associating various types of information and for managing the information [e.g., Abstract, Fig. 1 and associated texts], comprising:

Art Unit: 2161

a) a relationship management table for storing parent-child relationship in identification of each type of information [e.g., the unit 139, Fig. 1, the family frame as shown in 302, Fig. 3]

b) wherein degrees of relative are displayed in a tree view in the order of relatives of closer degree [e.g., col. 6, lines 42-64], and an abbreviation symbol [e.g., the information resolution adjuster icon 316, Fig. 3] is added after the name of the member if a member with the same CIF [e.g., the unit 304, Fig. 3] is already displayed in the tree view [e.g., Fig. 3 and associated texts].

Eaton did not give detail explanation for retrieval means to perform retrieval processing of various types of information from parent to child and from child to parent by association of the relationship management table in the information and the scope as designated.

However, Wical disclose the detail information retrieval processing means to perform retrieval processing of various types of information from parent to child and from child to parent by association of the relationship management table in the information and the scope as designated [e.g., Abstract, col. 6, lines 26-52, Fig. 5 and associated texts].

Eaton and Wical are both in the same endeavor to optimizing the data retrieval processing of hierarchical (or parent/child) structure over network, therefore, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person at the time the invention was made to modify Eaton's invention with the technique taught by Wical, because by doing so, the

Art Unit: 2161

combined system will be upgraded to facilitate a use to retrieve the desired data in any way he wants.

As to claim 2, in addition to the features recited in claim 1, the combined system of Eaton and Wical further discloses that various types of information are managed by a member management table where member data comprising said identification information and detailed information are stored [e.g., Wical: the document theme Vector table at col. 8, the knowledge base tables such as tables 2-5 at col. 15-16 and associated texts; col. 11, lines 62-64].

As to claim 3, in addition to the features recited in claim 2, the combined system of Eaton and Wical further discloses that the detailed information comprises classification information for classifying the members [e.g., Wical: the category a-x of table 1 at col. 8].

As to claims 4-6, in addition to the features recited in claim 3, the combined system of Eaton and Wical further discloses that classification information comprises type, rank, classification, and any source [e.g., Wical: col. 5, lines 52-55].

As to claim 7, in addition to the features recited in claim 1, the combined system of Eaton and Wical further discloses that relationship management table comprises information of mutual associating direction [e.g., Wical: the link of the index/topic table,

Art Unit: 2161

col. 30, lines 19-21], and degree of relationship [e.g., Wical: the theme strength of the Document Theme Vector table 1 at col. 8].

As to claims 21-27, these claims recite the same features as claims 1-7 with different wording, hence are rejected for the same reason.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 20-27, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where the best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2161

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Susan Y Chen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2161

October 24, 2006

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
Apu Mojiz  
Primary Examiner  
TC 2100